

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

PATRICK L. HOUSTON,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF  
SOCIAL SECURITY,  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:13-cv-720

Weber, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

**REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this Social Security appeal on October 9, 2013 against defendant Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) regarding a denial of social security benefits. (Doc. 2). Plaintiff was informed by the Court to promptly notify the Court of any changes in plaintiff's address which may occur during the pendency of this lawsuit. (Doc. 3). After certified mail addressed to plaintiff was returned by the Post Office as "Unclaimed" on March 6, 2013, this Court entered an Order to Show Cause on March 10, 2014, directing plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution and for failure to obey a Court Order. (Doc. 18). Plaintiff's response to the Court's Order was due on or before March 31, 2014. (*Id.*). The record demonstrates that plaintiff received this Order on March 17, 2014, via certified mail. (Doc. 19). As of the date of this Order, plaintiff has not filed a response to the Show Cause Order.

Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this matter and to obey an Order of the Court warrants dismissal of this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). *See Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109-10 (6th Cir. 1991). District courts have the power to *sua sponte* dismiss civil actions for want of prosecution to "manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962). *See also Jourdan*, 951 F.2d at 109. Though plaintiff is proceeding pro se, as stated by the Supreme Court, "we have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse

mistakes by those who proceed without counsel." *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993).

**IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff's case be **DISMISSED** in its entirety for want of prosecution and for failure to obey an Order of the Court; and
2. The Court certify pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) that for the foregoing reasons an appeal of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation would not be taken in good faith and therefore deny plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff remains free to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. *See Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803 (6th Cir. 1999), overruling in part *Floyd v. United States Postal Serv.*, 105 F.3d 274, 277 (6th Cir. 1997).

Date: 4/15/14

  
Karen L. Litkovitz  
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

PATRICK L. HOUSTON,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.

Case No. 1:13-cv-720  
Weber, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

COMMISSIONER OF  
SOCIAL SECURITY,  
Defendant.

**NOTICE TO THE PARTIES REGARDING THE FILING OF OBJECTIONS TO R&R**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> </ul>		<p>1. Article Addressed to:</p> <p><i>Patrick L. Houston 1621 Linn Street #1214 Cinti, OH 45214</i></p>	
		<p>D. Is delivery address different from item 1? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
		<p>A. Signature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Addressee</p>	
		<p>B. Received by (Printed Name) <input type="checkbox"/> C. Date of Delivery</p>	
		<p>3. Service Type <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail  <input type="checkbox"/> Registered <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt for Merchandise  <input type="checkbox"/> Insured Mail <input type="checkbox"/> C.O.D.</p>	
		<p>4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)	7011 3500 0001 5345 5543		
PS Form 3811, February 2004 Domestic Return Receipt			
102995-02-M-1540			